

REMARKS

The present amendment is responsive to the Official Action mailed January 13, 2004. A petition for a two-month extension of the term for response to said Official Action, to and including June 13, 2004, is transmitted herewith.

The present amendment is also intended to record the telephonic interview between undersigned counsel and Examiner Rick Kiltae Chang on May 17, 2004. The Examiner's courtesy and cooperation in granting and conducting said interview are appreciated.

In the interview, *Akiyama et al.*, U.S. Patent 3,801,388 was discussed. Counsel pointed out that in *Akiyama*, the posts (element 44) were formed on the first or upwardly-facing side of the dielectric, and that the asserted microelectronic device 40 in the reference was, in fact, positioned on the same side of the dielectric support substrate (including element 42 in Fig. 7F).

Counsel also pointed out that claim 1 of the present application requires positioning the microelectronic device "so that said microelectronic device overlies said second surface of said support structure." The Examiner asserted that the claim language "said microelectronic device overlies said second surface . . ." did not necessarily exclude the position of element 40 in Fig. 7 of *Akiyama*. However, the Examiner suggested that if claim 1 was amended to recite the step of attaching the microelectronic device to the second surface of the support structure, this distinction would be more clearly portrayed, and that claim 1 would be allowable. Counsel agreed to this change and noted that the recitation of "attaching a microelectronic device to said second surface of said support structure" did not imply any limitation as to how the microelectronic device was attached. For example, this recitation did not imply any limitation to the effect that the

microelectronic device was directly attached without any intervening element. Indeed, in the embodiment shown in the present drawings (Figs. 2A and 2B) and recited in some of the dependent claims (claim 12), a compliant structure intervenes between the support structure and the microelectronic device. Also, the recitation of "attaching" and "electrically connecting" in separate clauses of the claim does not impose any requirement as to whether the electrical connections do or do not form part or all of the physical attachment.

The rejection on *Akiyama* was the only rejection on prior art with respect to independent claim 1. Inasmuch as it was agreed that the foregoing amendment would render claim 1 allowable over *Akiyama*, further discussion of the rejection on *Akiyama* as applied to dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-12, 18-20, 48-50 and 52-55 is believed unnecessary. Likewise, further discussion of the rejections of dependent claims 13-14 and 51 on *Akiyama* in view of *Steranko*, U.S. Patent 3,465,435; of claims 15-16 on *Akiyama* in view of *Goldman*, U.S. Patent 5,239,746; and of claim 17 on *Akiyama* in view of *Goldman* and further in view of *Lin et al.*, U.S. Patent 5,273,938, is believed unnecessary. As a matter of law, a rejection of a dependent claim on prior art must be withdrawn when, as here, the independent claim is allowable over the art.

In the interview, counsel agreed that claims 56-58 inclusive would be canceled to simplify the issues and permit speedy allowance of the application with claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon, without prejudice to applicant's right to present those claims in a possible further continuing application.

Also, claims 39-47, previously withdrawn from consideration as a result of a restriction requirement, have been canceled without prejudice.


As it is believed that all of the objections, rejections and requirements set forth in the Official Action have been fully met by the present amendment, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marcus J. Millet  
Registration No.: 28,241  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

494604\_1.DOC